



**Steering Committee
Draft - Committee Meeting Summary**

January 9, 2002

The following is a summary of presentations given, issues raised, actions undertaken or recommendations made. When possible, lengthy discussions have been summarized into themes or summary statements.

Steering Committee Members Present:

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Peter Beaulieu
PSRC | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sandra Meyer
City of Renton | <input type="checkbox"/> Jack Kennedy
U.S. Army Corps |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jim Leonard
FHWA | <input type="checkbox"/> Mick Monken
City of Woodinville | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bernard Van deKamp
City of Bellevue |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brian O'Sullivan
Sound Transit | <input type="checkbox"/> Bill Barlow
Community Transit | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Leonard Newstrum
Yarrow Point |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jonathan Freedman
U.S. EPA | <input type="checkbox"/> Terra Hegy
WA Fish & Wildlife | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Don Cairns
City of Redmond |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jim Arndt
City of Kirkland | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Johannes Kurz
Snohomish County | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eddie Low
City of Bothell |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nancy Brennan-Dubbs
U.S. Fish & Wildlife | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ann Martin
King County | <input type="checkbox"/> John Witmer
FTA |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dan Drais
FTA | <input type="checkbox"/> Kim Becklund
City of Bellevue | <input type="checkbox"/> Seyed Safavian
City of Bothell |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mitch Wasserman
City of Clyde Hill | <input type="checkbox"/> Bob Sokol
City of Kenmore | <input type="checkbox"/> Don Wickstrom
City of Kent |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bill Vlcek
City of Lynnwood | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Debra Symmonds
City of Mercer Island | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fritz Timm
City of Newcastle |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Therese Swanson
WA Dept. of Ecology | <input type="checkbox"/> Sharon Griffin
Hunts Point | <input type="checkbox"/> Jim Morrow
City of Tukwila |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dan Burke
Port of Seattle | <input type="checkbox"/> Paul Carr
PSCAA | <input type="checkbox"/> Barbara Gilliland
Sound Transit |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Chuck Chappell
FHWA | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Craig Stone
WSDOT | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Tom Gibbons
NMFS | <input type="checkbox"/> Allyson Brooks
WA Dept. CT&E | |

Staff and Observers

Deborah Cornett, WDFW (alt.)
Patrick Lynch, Woodinville

Project Management Team

Mike Cummings, WSDOT
Don Samdahl, Mirai Associates
Ron Anderson, DEA
Christina Martinez, WSDOT
Jason McKinney, WSDOT

Keith McGowan, McGowan Environmental
Paul Bergman, PRR
Fen Hsiao, PRR

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Cummings started the meeting at 1:40 p.m.

Debra Cornett, attending in Terra Hegy's absence today, introduced herself. Jason McKinney, WSDOT, introduced himself, and said he is working with Christina Martinez on the project management team.

Mr. Cummings reviewed today's agenda:

- Program Update and Next Steps
- Preferred Alternative Description
- Implementation Plan Overview
- Environmental Mitigation Plan Approach

Mr. Cummings said Craig Stone would be reviewing the Implementation Plan.

Mr. Cummings reviewed the Road to Record of Decision:

January

- Environmental Program: approach, goals, objectives
- Preferred Alternative: Refine
- Phasing & Funding: Begin discussion
- EIS: Separate slide

February

- Environmental Program: Draft mitigation concept
- Phasing and funding: Draft concept
- Memorandum of Understanding (MOU): Draft

March

- Environmental Program: Conceptual mitigation plan
- Phasing and funding: Concept finalized
- MOU: Concept Approved
- Concurrence Point #3 & PFEIS

April/May: Publish FEIS

June/July: Record of Decision

Mr. Cummings reviewed the Steering Committee's future meetings' schedule and noted that they will once again be on an aggressive schedule. He said the environmental program would probably be developed in the committee sub-group.

Mr. Cummings said the PA and concept for mitigation are both part of Concurrence Point 3. He said they will need to develop the details of the MOU shortly.

Mr. Cummings gave a FEIS Update:

- Currently responding to comments
- Web link to review responses will be sent to agencies
 - Serious concerns should be e-mailed to Christina Martinez (martinezc@wsdot.wa.gov) by January 17th.
- Conducting Additional Analysis:
 - Wetlands, traffic, Preferred Alternative
- Making revisions to the document
- Developing the Mitigation Concept
- Preliminary FEIS out for your review in Mid-March

Mr. Cummings noted that Ms. Martinez is putting this together and will forward the committee the online link to the comments.

Ms. Martinez said the comments are only for agency-to-agency coordination and communication until finalized.

Mr. Cummings said in March or late February the Steering Committee will be asked to approve the publishing of the FEIS. He encouraged the committee to start reviewing it now because of its length. He said the FEIS would be published in two volumes due to the quantity of comments. He said the co-leads are meeting all day, every Thursday to go through the comments.

Mr. Cummings noted that Fritz Timms is now the representative for the City of Newcastle.

Mr. Cummings turned the meeting over to Mr. Samdahl to review the PA Description:

- Alternative #3 is recommended by consensus as the preferred alternative for the I-405 Corridor Program EIS.

(Subject to amendments/modifications described below)

Mr. Samdahl said he would be highlighting the elements where the Executive Committee recommendations differed from those of the Steering Committee. He also said there are a couple of areas the team is still working with the committees on. He said there should be a discussion on these areas because the environmental team is trying to get them nailed down. He said the rest of the environmental analysis needs to be completed in the next month for the FEIS while the Preliminary FEIS needs to be issued in March.

Mr. Samdahl said "recommendation" and "consensus" within the PA Description refers to the Executive Committee recommendation.

PA Consensus Elements:

- #1- TDM Package
- #2- Transit Expansion
- #4- Arterial HOV Priority
- #5- HOV Lane on I-405 with Direct Access Ramps
- #6- Add Park and Ride Capacity to Match Demand
- #7- Add Transit Center Capacity to Match Demand
- #8 - Basic I-405 Improvements
- #12- Add Collector Distributor lanes on I-405 where needed
- #14- SR 167 / 405 Interchange improvements
- #15- Improve Connecting Freeway Capacity to I-405
- #16- Implement planned arterial improvements
- #17- Expand Capacity on North-South Arterials
- #18- Upgrade Connecting Arterial Connections to I-405
- #19- Corridor Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements
- #20- Corridor Intelligent Transportation System Improvements
- #21- Corridor Freight Enhancements

Mr. Samdahl said the Executive Committee Consensus Elements are the same as the ones the Steering Committee approved.

Mr. Samdahl reviewed **TDM Regional Pricing**:

- Support use-based pricing on I-405 as part of regional strategy.

(Region should examine feasibility as part of separate study.)

He noted that certain issues were left unresolved at the time. He said he would go through the list and review how the Executive Committee voted on each element.

He said it was a close vote, but the Executive Committee supported use-based pricing. He said they used the same wording the Steering Committee came up with. In essence, the Executive Committee made a policy statement. He said regional pricing was not included in the modeling of the final EIS but the committee acknowledged that it's an important aspect to look at.

High Capacity Transit:

- BRT is preferred strategy

Mr. Samdahl said the Executive and Steering Committees recommended the same thing.

Central Core HCT Concept:

- Continue study of fixed guideway in central core area in concert with Translake and Sound Transit Phase 2 studies.

The Executive Committee recommendation was the same as the Steering Committee's.

Roadway Capacity Options:

- Add up to two mainline lanes in each direction to I-405. Include additional auxiliary, truck climbing and collector/distributor lanes to improve operational efficiencies as needed.

Mr. Samdahl said there was a lot of discussion on this element. One change the Executive Committee made is adding the language "up to two mainline lanes" to the element description. Otherwise, the recommendation was consistent with the Steering Committee's.

Embedded in the Roadway Capacity Options element was **adding a 3rd lane s. of I-90**. Mr. Samdahl said the Steering Committee voted to not add a third lane south of I-90.

Mr. Samdahl said the Executive Committee said that if additional auxiliary lanes need to be looked at. Then it's considered part of the recommendation but stopped. But they stopped short of saying another lane should be added. He said the project team is still looking at how to refine the element language for the PA.

SR 167 Roadway Capacity:

- Add up to two mainline lanes in each direction to SR 167. Include additional auxiliary, truck climbing and collector/distributor lanes to improve operational efficiencies as needed. (Subject to resolving environmental requirements and terminal points.)

The Steering Committee had supported adding up to 2 lanes. Mr. Samdahl said the sticking point was where to end the lanes. Mr. Samdahl said that at this point, the team has taken two lanes from I-405 south to the first interchange at south 180th and stopped there. Anything further south would be subject to another study. Mr. Samdahl said that they've tightened up the limits, created two additional lanes, and

developed design changes to minimize roadway. He said this is a little different than how they portrayed the element previously.

Mr. Newstrum said he didn't remember the element being portrayed in this manner at the Executive Committee meeting. He asked if this is something the team decided themselves?

Mr. Stone said it depends on the scope and how far the lanes can be taken. He said the project needs to move directly from this step into a corridor evaluation of SR 167. He said they need to take a look from Renton to Fife. The City of Kent is also interested in the connection through the north-south valley. He said they need to get the ramps to work down to 180th. He said the plans make sense as a logical limit.

Mr. Newstrum said 180th is not the last area of congestion in the corridor.

Mr. Stone said there are still many questions. The problem is that as they reach out, they start touching everything. He said the program needs to have perspective.

Mr. Samdahl said they felt they needed to have a firm boundary.

BNSF Preservation:

- Send letter to agencies with responsibility stating interest of I-405 Program Executive Committee in preserving future transportation opportunities in BNSF ROW.

**Will not be included in Final EIS*

Mr. Samdahl said the Steering Committee recommended strongly preserving the ROW. However, the Executive Committee voted to stop short of including the BNSF preservation in the PA, but did say they would prepare a letter to agencies that are effected by the BNSF, expressing interest of the program to preserve future transportation opportunities. He said they issued a statement of support but did not include preservation in the PA and in the FEIS.

Mr. Cummings noted the letter has already been sent. Mr. Kurz asked if there has been any response yet. Mr. Cummings said not yet.

Pedestrian and Bike Improvements:

- Include bike and pedestrian long trails.

Mr. Samdahl said the Steering Committee supported this element by a majority. The Executive Committee approved it by a consensus.

Mr. Samdahl said the other area they've been wrestling with is the n/s arterial improvements of Alternative 3 that were part of the consensus items. There has been discussion on whether to include additional arterial improvements that were part of Alternative 4. He said there has been some general support of this. At this point, although they are recommending to not include these other projects in the PA, they would like to call them out in the document. He said they would note that these are good projects subject to additional study by local agencies. He said the document would not include the project's environmental effects or cost. He said this is not something that will be taken out of the PA, but something the team is

recommending not to add. He noted this includes projects in Bothell, Redmond, Tukwila, etc.

Mr. Low said there is some confusion. He said they need to clarify what other projects there are. Mr. Samdahl said they've gone back and forth and Mr. Low's right, they need to clarify. He said they are trying to be consistent with Alternative 3 and not add a lot of other elements while still acknowledging other good projects.

Mr. Freedman asked if, in the FEIS, they would be saying the projects are good and will be looked at, but will not be part of the PA? Mr. Samdahl said the impacts are still counted as part of Alternative 4 but not part of the PA.

Mr. Freedman said they should clarify these projects are not, at this time, part of the PA. Mr. Samdahl agreed.

Mr. Samdahl said an agency could still use some of the findings from the EIS to help support decisions on those facilities, but the projects wouldn't be shown on a map of the PA.

Mr. Newstrum asked where information would be so if you decide to put these projects in the PA, you will know how it will affect it. Mr. Samdahl said any information on the projects would be included in the EIS.

Mr. Newstrum said this might make it hard for the decision makers. Mr. Samdahl said it's not likely the environmental review would be a substitute for project level analysis. From a programmatic standpoint, the projects have been evaluated and documented in the DEIS.

Mr. Samdahl said the Executive Committee recommendation might have been a little ambiguous.

Mr. Freedman said that if there's a possibility these projects might be selected in the future, there should be a short discussion of what different impacts there might be to the arterials. He said they don't have to go into great detail. However, he said they should have the data available so they can be traced in the future.

Mr. Cummings said the projects were not part of Alternative 3 and they weren't part of the amendment package. He said the team has to figure out how to document them. Or they have to say the projects should receive additional study. He said these projects would be less than 1% of the total cost of the program.

Mr. Kurz asked what the projects mean in terms of effectiveness? Mr. Cummings said there would be projects built that this program didn't conceive. There will be other projects that will occur which improvement effects haven't been captured by the team. Mr. Cummings said they have captured the effects as part of Alternative 4 in the DEIS, but not as part of Alternative 3.

Mr. Freedman said the program needs to make clear what they might do in the future and what projects they might include. Therefore, during the project level, they can go back and see which projects were part of Alternative 3. He said that by showing the work, people would be able to understand why the decisions were made.

Mr. Low said the PA now contains certain elements that may or may not have previously been part of Alt 3. Mr. Cummings said this is why the committees went through the amendment process.

Mr. Low said this needs to be documented. Mr. Cummings said it has already been documented.

Mr. Cummings said they want to make sure everyone knows what's included. Mr. Cummings said they have some data, but some things will come out of the program that they can't clarify. He said there would be things they will find as they go through the program that will warrant additional analysis.

Mr. Newstrum asked if this would require a supplemental EIS. Mr. Stone said all these components are being evaluated. He said they need to be clear whether the project is part of the program's original purpose and needs or whether it's under a separate umbrella.

Mr. Samdahl said there are a couple of implications from the recommendations, such as a buffer strip in terms of managed lanes. He said they are going back and making sure they have documented the potential impacts so if they decide to move ahead with an idea, they have it covered. However, the projects weren't necessary part of any of the four alternatives. He said they are trying to have as much coverage as they can and to be clear.

Mr. Kurz said he considered many of the projects necessary in order to make corridor improvements effective. However, he said it takes away the incentive for local governments to think about priorities.

Mr. Samdahl said they would bring back the final description of the PA, including cost, at the next meeting. He said the description is still evolving.

Mr. Stone took over the lead for the Legislative Update and Implementation discussion. Legislative Update:

- Governor requesting \$8.5 billion state package and \$5.1 billion regional package.
- \$2.2 billion requested for I-405 to construct new lanes from I-5 to I-90, including new SR 167 interchange.
- The issue in a nutshell: pass tax increase in Olympia or send to voters for approval?

Mr. Stone said they are hearing more and more about having an action that would go out to a March 12 vote.

I-405 Project Implementation:

- Multi-modal, Multi-agency Approach
- Key Principles
- Lessons Learned Nationally
- Project Management and Implementation Approach
- Segments, Construction Options & Schedules
- Funding
- Implementation Factors and Risks
- Key Questions & Delivery Elements

Mr. Stone reviewed the Multi-modal and Multi-agency Approach. Mr. Stone said they need to make key decisions regarding how to move forward. What are the agencies' roles?

Mr. Stone said the project team has already met with Metro and Sound Transit to discuss their roles if the project moves forward and what it means in regards to funding. He said there are many big policy questions. He said they also need to define expectations. He said they need a good strategy to communicate.

Key Principles:

FEIS / ROD "What" to Implement

Project Delivery "How" to Implement

- Strong Owner Role
- Need to be Flexible and Nimble
- Small WSDOT Team
- Build on National "Lessons Learned" and I-90 Experience
- Leverage Private Sector
 - Use General Engineering Consultant to Create Integrated Management Team
 - Use Consultants for Preliminary Design
 - Use Design-Build for Final Design & Construction

Mr. Stone said they are defining what they are going to implement. He said the next focus is how the components will be implemented.

Mr. Stone said the team has reviewed national best practices by cities with similar projects and have visited these locations. He said the I-405 corridor has the most similarities to what Denver is doing. He said ½ of the Denver project is HCT and they are also widening the facility by one or two lanes. He said both the statewide and regional package was put out to public vote and both votes passed. He also noted that San Diego has been the model for I-405's managed lanes program.

Mr. Stone reviewed what the project team has learned so far from reviewing other similar projects.

WSDOT Management Responsibility:

- Northwest Washington Division
- Urban Corridors Office
- I-405 Project Director
- Focused I-405 WSDOT Team

Mr. Stone reviewed the organizational structure of I-405 Corridor Program-relevant WSDOT segments.

I-405 Implemental Approach:

- Install Organizational Structure (GEC)
- Develop Environmental Vision
 - Environmental Permit Strategy
- Preliminary Design Corridor Wide
 - 0-5% Design
 - Focus on "Hot-Spots"
- Segment Preliminary Design and Environmental Documentation
- Design-Build Contracts

Mr. Kurz asked who determines which 5% is going to be done by the consultant. What's the other 95%? Mr. Stone said the 5% represents corridor-wide aspects.

Mr. Newstrum asked if the preliminary design refers to the whole corridor. Mr. Stone said yes.

I-405 General Engineering Consultant's Initial Tasks:

- Project Management Strategies
- Project Delivery Strategies
- Environmental Vision
- Corridor Preliminary Design 0-5%
- Cost Verification

Mr. Stone reviewed the I-405 Preferred Contracting Method.

Mr. Stone reviewed the Project Segments:

- I-5 Tukwila to Factoria
- Factoria thru Bellevue
- Kirkland to Bothell
- Bothell to Lynnwood I-5

He said these are general segments that help the team plan for contracting. If they only get enough money for one segment, then they have to decide which project is most important.

Ms. Martin asked how this fits with what was described in the earlier implementation approach. She asked if the team is thinking about this in terms of phasing or are they just breaking up the corridor into manageable chunks? She asked if they are setting priorities across segments instead of by segments?

Mr. Stone said they haven't discussed this yet. He said they need to decide what makes sense. He said they have discussed how to phase in terms of transit, or arterials or roadway, etc. but they don't know how much money they are going to have.

Mr. Newstrum asked how they see SR 520 fitting in? Mr. Stone said one of Mr. Cummings's roles is determining what is SR 520, what is Alaskan Way viaduct, etc. and if segments are done, what segments fit together, etc.

Mr. Beaulieu asked who the partners would be. Mr. Stone said this is part of the question. They already know WSDOT will be there. He said this is why they are talking with Metro and Sound Transit. He said they asked them where they are in the work program, funding, etc. Then they have to have a conversation with local jurisdictions.

Mr. Beaulieu asked if the MOU directly addresses this. Mr. Stone said he hopes it will include a matrix that says what the projects are and who is leading it. He said he would like to have a discussion with the Executive Committee about this.

Mr. Low asked if they are really talking only about an area within a segment when they refer to "segment." Mr. Cummings said yes.

Mr. Freedman said these are critical questions. If funding is going to come in drips and drabs, than it's going to be difficult to phase anything. Mr. Stone said they need to model this and decide what gives the program the most bang for the buck. He said much of it is political.

Mr. Freedman asked if all the questions would be part of the conversation. Mr. Stone said these questions haven't been answered yet. Mr. Anderson said the process does have to get blessed by PSRC.

Mr. Beaulieu said these are operating agencies trying to align the program. He said they need to distinguish between planning and operating projects. Mr. Beaulieu asked who "we" is. He said they need to be clear. He said he's pleased that the idea of an MOU is where they are headed because they have done a lot of work.

Mr. Stone said that, hopefully, the program could be structured so the right decisions are being made. He said they need to capture a vision and what they've done in 2002. Mr. Stone said he wants to go into the public vote with some understanding among partners. He emphasized the need to have the agencies in agreement, including utilities.

Mr. Newstrum said they should include funding points and costs so inconsistencies can be called out. Mr. Stone said a funding plan was developed in 1988 and has been used as a reference for each agency's responsibility since.

Construction Options and Schedules:

- Funding Availability will Determine Option
- Currently Preparing for "High" – 10 year delivery
 - High – Concurrent Segments – 10 years
 - Medium – Sequenced Segments – 18 years
 - Low – Hot Spot Improvements as funding becomes available

Mr. Stone said they are currently looking at the ability to deliver a program in the 10-year period. He said they are looking at it as if funding was not as issue.

Mr. Stone reviewed the Project implementation schedule.

Mr. Beaulieu suggested having three or four timelines for different modes so it doesn't narrow the project down. He asked if they would break it out by segments, hot spots, modes, etc? Mr. Cummings said they are trying to work as hard as they can with other agencies.

Ms. Martin said "segment" implies roadway. She suggested separating into "areas" instead. Mr. Stone said they might end up with packages. Mr. Beaulieu said they're looking for action packages. Mr. Newstrum said Sound Transit and the segments might not apply to the packages.

Mr. Stone reviewing Funding:

- Existing - \$10.5M "Seed Money" to start
- Proposed – Governor's \$8.5B Transportation Budget includes \$2.2B for I-405
- Needed for 10 year Delivery
 - \$50M this biennium to continue essential preparation
 - Minimum of \$250M for Advanced R/W, Environmental Mitigation,

- Utility Relocations and early TDM and ITS Implementation needed in 2003-05
- \$2.0B Commitment for 2003-05 to Start Design-Build Contract for 1st Segment
- \$1.3B Commitment for 2005-07 to Start Design-Build Contract for 2nd Segment
- \$2.0B Commitment for 2007-09 to Start Design-Build Contract for 3rd and 4th Segments

Mr. Stone reviewed the program's Implementation Factors and Risks:

- Funding Availability
 - Funding adequate for essential first steps
 - Funding Supports Early R/W, Environmental and Utility Actions
 - Continuous Funding Commitment Once Started
- Environmental
 - Development of Environmental Vision for Corridor
 - Successful Agency Environmental Permit Strategies based on Vision
- MOUs with Community & Agency Support to gain timely concurrence
- Design-Build will require Modifications of R/W Process & Utility Relocations

Mr. Stone reviewed the Key Questions:

Scope of the Preferred Alternative – Additional Elements Increase Cost
Cost Elements Being Analyzed

–Basic Alternative #3

- Items removed
 - BNSF
- Items added
 - Managed Lanes (4 foot buffer)
 - Collector Distributor/Auxiliary Lanes S. of I-90
 - SR 167 add lane south of I-405
- Items under review
 - How to portray the cost of I-405 & SR 520 Interchange
 - Arterials not part of Alternative 3
 - Some Direct Access Projects not costed-out as part of Alternative 3
- Resolving How to Proceed with Environmental Vision and Early Environmental Mitigation
- Permit Streamlining – Ensure Process Moves Quickly Enough to Benefit Project(s)
- Process for Local Agency Decision Making that Leads to Timely Project Implementation
- Executive Committee Role

Mr. Stone said the intent is to bring back a new cost estimate to the committee in February.

I-405 Executive Committee:

- Executive Committee Has Been Important to Project Support
- Need to Maintain High Level Interest and Support
- Executive Committee Can Help Maintain Project Scope and Control of Unprogrammed Requests

Key Delivery Elements:

- Early Right of Way Acquisitions
- Advanced Utility Relocations
- Multi-Agency Role
 - Define Roles and Responsibilities
 - Matrix of Program Projects
 - Phasing & Funding
 - Develop MOUs

Mr. Stone reviewed the program's Implementation Plan.

New \$1,000,000 Federal Grant for I-405 Program:

- Support Development of the Interlocal Agreements to Reduce SOV Trips
- Undertake Activity Center TDM Case Studies
- Recommend Optimal TDM Programs and SOV Reduction Targets
- Develop Recommendations for TDM Focused on Non-Commute Trips
- Coordinate Planning for TDM Construction Mitigation with Trans-Lake

A member of the public asked what the legislature said when the team asked for full guarantee of funding. Mr. Stone said the team asked about steps on how to put together a full bond program. They can phase the bonding, but they have to make a full funding commitment. What they've typically done is given a high cash and low cash flow to contractors who need to meet certain targets.

Mr. Newstrum asked about the slide's two last bullets. He said he doesn't know what they can do on I-405 to mitigate construction with Translake. He asked for an example. He asked what they could do on I-405 to mitigate closing SR 520. Mr. Cummings said carpool and vanpool programs.

Mr. Anderson added through public information programs. He said people won't make trips if they know something's going to be closed down.

Mr. Low said a million is not full funding, but clearly an I-405 discussion is to have some mind on an oversight committee regarding early actions. Mr. Cummings said this is what it's doing. It's taking what the program has done to make it real.

Mr. Bealiau said there's a need to tailor the TDM program to select the PA. He said the third bullet should note: "tailored to the selected PA."

Mr. Freedman asked how the success of TDM can be measured?

Mr. Kurz said it's difficult to measure. The reason transit goes up or down can have other reasons.

Mr. Cummings said there's some ways to measure TDM thru employer sites.

Ms. Martin asked how specific the thinking is on MOU's. She said this is the place where you begin to get commitments on elements such as having transit service in place before starting a particular project or having improvements on local roadway before others. She asked if this is the kind of detail that will be included in the MOU?

Mr. Stone said there's clearly a phasing and funding discussion going on here and they don't want to lock themselves into something. He said it would be really nice to have these priorities down when they move forward.

Mr. Kurz said it's not easy to nail these issues down in the MOU because the local government makes budget decisions from one year to the other.

Ms. Martin said she recognizes the difficulty, but to avoid a uni-modal approach, precursors have to be identified before other pieces are able to move forward. She said it is just a question.

Mr. Cummings said they would like to have as much transit up and running early as possible.

I-405 Corridor Environmental Program (CEP):

- The urban corridor projects, individually and collectively, provide a unique opportunity to positively address noise, air quality, water quality and quantity, salmon habitat, and urban growth issues.

I-405 CEP Goals:

- Integrate transportation and environmental investments to have a positive impact (better than today) on the critical natural resources and supporting habitat
- Ensure transportation related environmental funds are spent toward the greatest environmental benefit (use a watershed based approach)

Mr. Cummings reviewed the I-405 CEP Process.

He asked if the committee would mind if WIRA, tribes and utilities are invited to the sub-committee meetings. He emphasized that utility is important because the team has already begun to look at what projects should be prioritized. He asked the committee for their thoughts.

Mr. Freedman said he is concerned this will make the sub-committee group very large. Ms. Martin reminded the group that the sub-committee is a group set up by the Steering Committee a few months ago. Ms. Swanson said there has never been a formal roster. Ms. Martin said there is an average of 8-12 attendees at every meeting, but everyone from the Steering Committee is invited to attend.

Mr. Freedman said that if these additional agencies have to be there, than it's ok.

Mr. Cummings said they would have to work with them at some point anyway.

Mr. Beaulieu said they can either choose to work inside the box and argue or they can partner on the projects that have already been identified. He said they should do something smart together. He said this is an opportunity for an institutional breakthrough that can be part of the Reinventing NEPA process.

Mr. Freedman said the larger the group gets, the harder it will be to move forward.

Mr. Low said he does not disagree with inviting them, as long as it is manageable.

Mr. Cummings said people have asked how the sub-committee relates to TPEAC. So the issue is who's initiating the process? And how to do they relate to each other?

He suggested they develop a program and take it to TPEAC. He said this would not necessarily be for their approval because it has to be decided what approval TPEAC

can give, anyway. He suggested the committee develop a process and program and to give to TPEAC for their use.

Mr. Kurz asked who TPEAC is and what authority they have. Mr. Cummings said they were set up by the legislature.

Ms. Martinez said the federal agencies, legislatures, etc. had a part in setting TPEAC up.

Mr. Cummings said SR 167/I-405 is one of the identified streamlining projects. He said everybody has been struggling with how the relationship works.

Ms. Swanson said they don't have regulatory authority. This committee will approve processes that will be used in a streamlining package. Mr. Beaulieu asked if it is a drafting committee. Ms. Swanson said she doesn't know.

Mr. Samdahl said they are an advisory committee.

Mr. Stone said they report to the legislature and have a deadline.

Ms. Martin asked if the team is suggesting that the program update and advise TPEAC because they are already far into the process? Ms. Martin asked for clarification that a stamp of approval is not needed from TPEAC.

Mr. Cummings said TPEAC does have a higher-level of people in important organizations. He said they might help the program if we run into problems.

Ms. Martin asked if this would delay their schedule?

Mr. Freedman said it may increase the upward reporting requirements. Mr. Cummings said this is a possibility.

Mr. Low said this chart implies that a recommendation from the Executive Committee goes to TPEAC. Mr. Cummings said they only need to forward the process to TPEAC, but approval is not required.

Mr. Cummings said they would like to use the I-405 process they've developed as a mechanism to tell TPEAC about the project's progress.

Mr. Newstrum said they need to show the relationship of PMT and TPEAC.

Mr. Cummings said he's trying to show what information they're giving to TPEAC and how they're developing it. He said the team wants to show what kind of issues they've run into working with this strategy. He said TPEAC may have examples from other projects that will be helpful to the I-405 program.

Mr. Newstrum said suggested they skip the Executive Committee in the process. He said there needs to be a group that speaks for resource agencies. Mr. Cummings said resource agencies are already there.

Ms. Swanson said it would be useful to have a TPEAC presentation for this group. She suggested the members take a look at the TPEAC website

Mr. Kurz said TPEAC relates mostly to project level environmental work.

Mr. Cummings said TPEAC also relates to programmatic work. Mr. Kurz said programmatic work is too general to either agree or disagree with it.

CEP Elements and Schedule:

- January
 - Approach: Overall & early action
 - Goals
 - Objectives (PA working group)
- February
 - Scenario (SR 167 & I-405 Area)
 - Memorandum Of Understanding (Phase 1)
 - Concurrence Form

Mr. Cummings said that in terms of goal and objectives, they just took what came out of the PA working group and put it into the policies. He said this is just a draft.

Mr. Cummings reviewed the SR 167 & I-405 CEP Scenario. He clarified the project boundaries.

Ms. Meyers asked if the purpose of this is to have a test case. Mr. Cummings said yes.

Mr. Cummings reviewed the Functional Analysis Chart Summary. He said they are currently looking at functions that the program is impacting. He said each function has many subcomponents to it.

Mr. Low asked about the watershed and program approach. He said it appears that impacts are project specific, but opportunities to mitigate may involve other projects. How do you take one and apply it to others?

Mr. Cummings said they would look at the function they're impacting and will look at opportunities to deal with functional impacts. He said they might not necessarily be on-site, however, there are a number of ways to do them on-site if necessary.

Ms. Martin asked if the primary source of baseline conditions would be from the EIS? Mr. Cummings said the information is from the EIS with a little additional research. He said the issue for them is how they will deal with functional loss and then make agreements on how to deal with them. He said they would quantify what this is during the project level. Mr. Cummings said that at the next meeting, they will have a chart with all the categories and will start to explain what they are.

Ms. Meyers asked if they're using existing information. Mr. Cummings said they are mostly using existing information. He said they don't want to gather unnecessary information and will only look for it when they need it. He said they are also gathering regulations from each jurisdiction on how they deal with them.

Mr. Cummings said that, fundamentally, what the program wants is to have a positive impact when complete. He said they want to make sure they've done the right thing. For legal reasons, if the program can't accomplish this, they will need to work through the issues.

Ms. Martin asked if this is beginning to build a bridge between the programmatic and project level. Mr. Cummings said yes.

Ms. Martin said it's a transition between the two levels and will give confidence to the local jurisdictions and agencies as they sign the final documentation. Mr. Cummings agreed. He said they might document this process in the MOU. He emphasized the need to get thru this in a timely manner.

Mr. Cummings said TPEAC is looking for something from them in February.

Ms. Meyers asked what TPEAC would like. Mr. Cummings said they would like to know where we are headed.

Future Committee Roles and Responsibilities after ROD:

The I-405 Program will transition from corridor to project level work program. Some options to consider:

- Continue on in current structure?
- Move organization into Eastside Transportation Partnership (ETP)?
- Meet on quarterly or less frequent basis?
- Other ideas

Mr. Cummings said the Steering Committee is committed to the program through to the last issue of the EIS. He said the team is trying to figure out how to deal with the future of the Steering Committee as the program moves through the process. He said they need to begin thinking about how the Steering Committee will move into future phases. Mr. Cummings asked the committee to forward any thoughts and ideas to him.

Mr. Kurz said the ETC is not ready to deal with this type of project. He said WSDOT wants to maintain a certain leadership. He said there is also a matter of staffing and that ETP might have some limitations. He suggested that this would be way beyond their resources.

Mr. Freedman asked who the decision-making authority would be. Would the Steering Committee have the same responsibilities or just be advisory? Mr. Cummings said this is the question.

Ms. Martin asked when the two sub-committee meetings are. Ms. Martinez said tentatively Jan. 22nd and 30th.

Mr. McKinney said they would send out an email notification once they are confirmed.

Mr. Cummings adjourned the meeting at 3:55 p.m.